

**FEASIBILITY STUDY OF REMOVING THE SCHOOLS  
IN THE SOUTHEAST AREA OF LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
FROM THE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
MARCH 25, 2001**

**Nigro Nigro & White LLP  
1559 Beryl Street  
San Diego, CA**

Senate Bill 1380 (Chapter 335/2000) authored by Senator Martha Escutia, directed “the Superintendent of Public Instruction to enter into a contract with an independent contractor for the purpose of conducting a study to determine the feasibility of reorganizing Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) by removing from that district the schools in the southeast area of the district, including those schools located in Bell, Southgate, Cudahy, Maywood, Huntington Park, Vernon, and the unincorporated areas of Florence/Graham and Walnut Park. This study shall assess the potential benefits and disadvantages of that would result from such reorganization of the district.”

Nigro Nigro and White, LLP (NNW) was awarded the contract through a competitive bid process coordinated by the California Department of Education, School Fiscal Services Division, Office of School District Organization and Charter Schools. NNW is an independent certified public accounting firm that specializes in auditing and consulting services, including school district organization, for California public schools.

The study completed by NNW evaluates the feasibility of the reorganization against the criteria contained in *Education Code* sections 35753 and 35730.1 and other conditions that include: overcrowding of schools, concerns about student performance, the impact on employee rights and contracts, opportunities for administrative and operational effectiveness and efficiency, potential fiscal benefits, the impact on LAUSD, opportunities for collaboration with municipalities, and the potential for educational gains. NNW also facilitated two community meetings to gather input from citizens.

The following chart summarizes NNW’s conclusions and whether or not it appears that the state criteria would be met:

<b>STATE CRITERIA</b>	<b>MET?</b>	<b>STATE CRITERIA</b>	<b>MET?</b>
Adequacy of size	Yes	School housing	No
Community identity	Yes	Property values	Yes
Equitable property division	Yes	Fiscal affect	Yes
Race/Ethnic issues	Yes	Socioeconomic diversity	Yes
Cost to the State	Yes	Geographical compactness	Yes
Educational programs	Yes		

[Table of Contents](#)